

In addition to the additional business acquisitions likely with the proposed bridge structures, the cost of the proposed Lonyo bridge could be at least 50 percent more than the underpass. The cost difference between a proposed Central Avenue bridge versus an underpass would likely be at least 75 percent. So, bridge structures are not preferable options to the underpasses.

3.2.2 CBRA Basic Premises

Central to the overall CBRA proposal is the following: "... the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal will be one component of a regional intermodal system – it will not function as a consolidated regional intermodal terminal (emphasis added)." Additionally, the proposal indicates that "... no incremental expansion of the (existing) intermodal terminal outside of the existing rail property line" will occur.

It is these basic premises which do not meet the purpose of the proposed project, which is "... to support the economic competitiveness of southeastern Michigan by improving freight transportation opportunities and efficiencies for business and industry. The goal is to develop a regional intermodal facility with sufficient capacity to provide for existing and future intermodal demand."

Therefore, the CBRA proposal is inconsistent with the understanding that government investments will only be made in roads (like new interchanges at both I-94/Rotunda and I-75 at the rail line near the Ambassador Bridge) if intermodal consolidation occurs. And, the proposal to convert land in the terminal to an internal truck road and/or a buffer is not acceptable to the two rail companies that own the property.

3.2.3 Conclusion

The CBRA proposal does not address the purpose of the DIFT project. It is also unworkable both internally and externally from an engineering standpoint. While the terminal is not expanded, and no displacements






















would occur, displacements would have been major with the proposed truck access and the bridges. The terminal will remain unchanged per CBRA, so the dust problem will continue. Because no state or federal funds would be available to build the proposed Lonyo/Central bridges, these streets would still cross the rail yard at grade. Trains would block them regularly causing community cohesion impacts. Noise from the trains would impact 35 residences with no sound wall to be constructed. And, noise would be an issue on Livernois and Dagoon from Vernor to Lafayette without the diversion of trucks to a special road reserved for them. While impacts on cultural resources will not occur, environmental justice will be an issue as benefits that would flow with federal investment in terminal expansion will not with the CBRA plan.

3.3 Consultant's Conclusion on Terminal Expansion Proposals

The community of southwest Detroit/east Dearborn has as its biggest neighbor the existing 500-acre rail terminal centered on the Detroit-Livernois Yard. The people of this area have invested, block by block, in creating an environment to revitalize it. The increase in population in the last 10 years is evidence that this effort is succeeding. However, little has changed over the years at the rail terminal. So, sustaining the viability of southwest Detroit/east Dearborn as the rail property remains unchanged and intermodal traffic increases will be a difficult challenge.

Rail Strategy 1, the No-Action approach, is expected to be accompanied by growth in intermodal traffic from a few trains today to two dozen by 2025 and from 2000 DIFT trucks in the study area today to 7,300 daily in 2025. If past is prologue, the railroads will not pave the terminal surface to control dust (Table 3-3). A buffer will not be created between the community and the terminal. While no acquisitions will occur, soil contamination on some properties surrounding the terminal will not be cleaned up. Safety concerns at Lonyo and Central as they carry traffic across the rail yard will not be

Table 3-3
DIFT Feasibility Study
Consultant's Conclusions
Terminal Expansion Proposals

Rail Strategy Issue	RS 1	RS 2	RS 3
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No EPA standard exceeded ■ Dust an issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No EPA standard exceeded ■ Terminal surface paved ■ Some improvement in regional air quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No EPA standard exceeded ■ Terminal surface paved ■ Major improvement in regional air quality 
Community Cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Negative effect without grade separations at Lonyo/Central and buffer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Negative effect without grade separations at Lonyo/Central and buffer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Positive effect with grade separations at Lonyo/Central and buffer 
Cultural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No effect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No effect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No effect 
Displacements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None ■ Property contamination not addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 0 residences/13 businesses ■ Property contamination not addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 74 residences ■ 76 businesses with contamination remediation 
Engineering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No significant difficulties ■ No community benefits because of lack of government investment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No significant difficulties ■ A few community benefits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No significant difficulties ■ Significant community drainage and safety improvements because of major government investment 
Environmental Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Denial of benefits an issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No disproportionate negative effect ■ A few community benefits because of limited government investment outside terminal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Significant positive community benefits major government investment outside terminal 
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 35 residences impacted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None, impacts mitigated with sound wall 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None, impacts mitigated with sound wall and buffer 

Source: The Corradino Group of Michigan, Inc.

Legend:



Unfavorable effect



Some negative effect



Some positive effect



Positive effect